

Claim Objections:

Claims 27 and 28 are objected to by the Examiner for allegedly being duplicate claims of Claims 21 and 22. Applicants respectfully submit that these objections are now moot in light of the cancellation of Claims 27 and 28.

Rejection Under 35 USC § 112:

Claim 10 is rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection is now moot in light of the cancellation of Claim 10. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that new Claims 30-49 are not indefinite.

Rejections Under 35 USC 103:

Claims 10 and 16-29 are rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC 103 as allegedly defining obvious subject matter over U.S. Patent No. 5,990,065 to Vinson et al. ("Vinson").

Applicants respectfully submit that these rejections are now moot in light of the cancellation of Claims 10 and 16-29.

Applicants respectfully submit that new Claims 30-49 are not anticipated by nor rendered obvious over Vinson because Vinson fails to teach each and every element of the claimed invention as claimed in new Claims 30-49. More particularly, Vinson fails to teach a polymeric suds stabilizer as a suds booster.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest effort to place the present claims in condition for allowance. WHEREFORE, entry of the amendments provided herewith, reconsideration of the claims as amended in light of the Remarks provided, withdrawal of the claims rejections, and allowance of new Claims 30-49 are respectfully requested.

In the event that issues remain prior to allowance of the noted claims, then the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' undersigned attorney to discuss any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

PETER ROBERT FOLEY, et al.

By 

C. Brant Cook, Esq.
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 39,151
(513) 627-2013

January 7, 2003
Customer No. 27752